

REMARKS

This Preliminary Amendment is being filed concurrently with the filing of an RCE for the captioned patent application repeating all of the Remarks in the response to the Final Rejection mailed July 9, 2009 and to further amend claims 1 and 9 to emphasize that the function of the plurality of storage cells have a predetermined storage cell assigned for capturing counterfeit notes. This is supported in the Specification, which uses the expression "capture bin" for this predetermined cell.

The rejection of claims 1, 3-7 and 9-13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent Publication No. US 2004-0084521A1 by Nagayoshi et al in view of Fukatsu (USP 4,524,268) and in view of Blair (USP 6,811,016) is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has previously recited the references Nagayoshi and Fukatsu with the reference Blair being newly cited.

Blair discloses an apparatus for classification and sorting. When an operator puts currency notes into the input cassette 108, the notes may be removed one by one and placed into the currency processing machine 200 to authenticate the notes. All of the notes including unfit and counterfeit notes are returned to the discharge slot cassettes 101-106 marked as unfit notes. The cassettes 101-106 include all notes and are all returned to the user. All of the slot cassettes 101-106 are discharge slots into which the unfit and counterfeit notes are routed with the

cassettes 101-106 sealed and returned to the user.

In contrast, according to the present invention, a temporary money holder exists for temporarily storing authenticated notes, unidentifiable and counterfeit notes but not rejected notes. The plurality of storage cells also has a predetermined storage cell assigned for separately capturing temporary stored notes but not rejected notes, which constitutes a predetermined capture bin to which counterfeit notes are assigned and never returned to the user. The capturing of counterfeit notes in a capture bin, which is separate from all other storage cells, is of itself non-obvious in view of Blair which does not teach or suggest this concept.

The retention of counterfeit notes permits further examination and constitutes proof that the notes are indeed counterfeit notes. Please be advised that all of the cells for printed notes other than unidentifiable/counterfeit notes are in the form of detachable cassettes. Please refer to the specification page 10, lines 20-31.

Since Blair does not teach the concept of capturing counterfeit notes in an assigned predetermined storage cell which are never returned to the user, is fundamentally different in apparatus from Blair.

In the subject application, only authenticated notes temporary stored in a temporary money holder will be returned in response to a "return" instruction. Rejected notes are separately returned while counterfeit notes are never returned. Please refer to the specification page 11, lines 308.

The Examiner continues to refer to Col. 3, lines 33-46 of Blair, which clearly

teaches returning the authentic notes as well as unfit or counterfeit notes into the same discharge slot cassettes 101-106 (see lines 40-42), which are sealed and shipped to the user (lines 45-46). There is no capture bin taught in Blair for capturing counterfeit notes much less in a manner so that the captured counterfeit notes are never returned to the user. This feature makes counterfeit notes available at a later time for further examination, if need be. This is a major distinction between Blair and the subject application and is supported by col. 3, lines 33-46 referred to by the Examiner.

Accordingly, no basis exists for the allegation of the Examiner that the storage cell configuration of Blair is the same as applicant's and may be incorporated in the machine of Nagayoshi for determining at a later time whether a crime has been committed by using the retained counterfeit notes as proof. Blair does not provide a predetermined storage cell or capture bin inside the machine for preserving unidentified and counterfeit notes within the machine itself, separated from other printed notes which are returned to the user.

Moreover, claims 1 and 9 require a temporary money holder for temporarily storing both authenticated notes and counterfeit notes with all other printed notes classified as rejected notes and with the rejected notes segregated from the temporarily stored printed notes. In Blair, notes are classified as authentic or unfit. Counterfeit notes are unfit notes, both of which are treated the same way and returned to the same discharge cassette appropriately marked for unfit notes. What is critical in distinguishing claims 1 and 9 from Blair, is the use of both a temporary money holder for printed notes other than rejected notes and a plurality of storage

cells provided inside the machine which are assigned for separately capturing counterfeit notes. Blair does not teach this arrangement. Moreover, both claims 1 and 9 require a rejection unit for accumulating printed notes which have been identified and classified as rejected notes (not the counterfeit notes) for return to a user.

In Blair, the counterfeit and unfit notes are treated the same and are returned to the same group of discharge slot cassettes 101-106 and although marked differently, all of the cassettes are sealed and returned to the user. Marking the notes differently does not change the teaching. Accordingly, the teaching in Blair is entirely different from the subject invention. The Examiner has apparently overlooked this simply because Blair marks the notes differently. No basis exists for the allegation of the Examiner "that the counterfeit notes remain captured for further examination for the purpose of detecting whether a crime has been committed". This is clearly opposite to what is being taught in Blair nor is it suggested. The Examiner has imputed the teaching of the subject invention into Blair without any basis for doing so.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 and 9 as being obvious over the teaching of Nagayoshi '521, Fukatsu '268 in view of Blair '016 should be withdrawn since Blair does not support the allegation of the Examiner. Claims 3-7 and 10-13 are dependent claims which depend respectively from claims 1 and 9 and accordingly are believed patentable for the same reasons as given above.

Claim 8 is independently rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagayoshi in view of Fukatsu and Blair for the same reasons as applied to claim 7 and further in view of Utz (USP 6,874,682).

Claim 8 is a dependent claim which depends from claim 7 which in turn depends from claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn for the same reasons as given above relative to claim 1. The Examiner is again relying on Blair for teaching a predetermined storage cell assigned for storing counterfeit notes that remain captured for further examination. However, this is contrary to the teaching of Blair in Col. 3, lines 33-46. As stated above, in Blair, the authenticated notes as well as the unfit or counterfeit notes are all returned to an appropriate discharge slot cassettes 101-106 all of which are sealed and shipped i.e., returned to the user. The fact that unfit or counterfeit notes in Blair may be returned to one of the discharge slots marked for unfit notes is irrelevant, since the system handles them exactly as they handle authenticated notes in that all of the discharge cassettes are sealed and returned. Moreover, Utz does not use a trace unit for purposes of notifying the user of the existence of counterfeit notes. Blair may return unfit notes and counterfeit notes into one slot and authentic notes into another but all are treated alike in that they are placed in the same discharge cassettes 101-106 sealed and returned to the user.

Applicant has reviewed the reference in Utz cited by the Examiner in col. 20, line 59 through Col. 21, line 8 as teaching an operation for correlating suspect notes or other documents by an operator outside of the printed note deposit machine claimed by applicant, i.e. external to the printed note deposit machine. No mention

is made of internally capturing counterfeit notes and internally retaining the captured counterfeit notes never to be returned to the user which is the essence of the subject invention. The Examiner is extrapolating from the teaching of Utz in col. 20, line 59 through Col. 21, line 8 without basis. The trace unit in Utz is not intended to track down a user of notes for the purpose of notifying said user of the existence of counterfeit notes. This is not being taught or suggested in Col. 20, line 59 through Col. 21, line 8 nor suggested. The trace unit is external of the printed note deposit machine and serves a different purpose. In the printed note deposit machine of the present invention counterfeit notes are retained and separated from both authentic and rejected notes inside the machine and are never returned to the user. A trace unit cannot provide this function.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there has clearly been a misunderstanding on the part of the Examiner of the teaching of Claims 1 and 9 and a misunderstanding of the teaching of Blair. The printed note deposit machine as taught in claims 1 and 9 contains a temporary money holder for temporarily storing authenticated notes counterfeit notes and unidentified notes and has a plurality of storage cells inside the printed note deposit machine with the plurality of storage cells having a predetermined storage cell assigned for separately storing and retaining counterfeit notes. Rejected notes which are neither counterfeit notes, unidentified notes or authentic notes are treated separately. The captured counterfeit notes in the predetermined storage cell are not returned to the user which is fundamentally different from the teaching in Blair and the concept taught in Utz.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-13 are believed patentable over the cited references.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 3-13 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Eugene Lieberstein
Registration No. 24,645

Customer # 79681
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
45 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10111
Tel: 212-589-4634 /Fax: 212-589-4201

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this Preliminary Amendment w/RCE is being submitted to the USPTO via EFS-Web, addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450, on August 17, 2009.

By



Audrey de Souza